SIEC ADVISORY WORKING GROUP (SAW)
October 29, 2003

Members attending this meeting:

- Alan Komenski, Association of Washington Cities
- Clark Palmer, Washington State Patrol
- Fred DeBolt, Washington State Department of Transportation
- Jim Hall, (technical representative) Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs
- Jim Broman, Washington State Fire Chiefs Association
- Joe Huden, Washington State Department of the Military
- John McIntosh, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Tom Griffin, Washington State Emergency Management Association (telephone)
- Tom Parma, Washington State Department of Information Services
- Scott Bream, Washington State Department of Information Services
- Dennis Hausman, Washington State Department of Information Services

Announcement

It was announced that Jim Hall (representing the technical interests of the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs) and Clark Palmer would act as co-chairs of the SAW.

Speaking with the co-chairs of the SAW it was agreed to maintain the same meeting schedule as we became accustomed to. The SAW will meet every-other Wednesday from 1:30 until 3:00 PM. Meetings will continue to be held at the Department of Information Services, located at 1110 Jefferson Street SE, Olympia. **The next scheduled meeting will be November 12.**

Suggestion in the interests of time

It was recommended and a consensus was achieved to limit subsequent SAW meetings to a ninety-minute period.

Governance Models

Although not on the agenda, we discussed possible governance models for the SAW. Should there be designated 'voting' members of the SAW? How would voting members be selected? How would the membership of a work group hold as sub-groups were formed?

It became clear that the majority of those in attendance believed that the SAW should be governed via consensus. When a complete consensus could not be obtained, the majority would rule. When bringing information to the SIEC, the staff will indicate both the majority and minority opinion.

SIEC Timetable

A timetable (Gant Chart) was distributed to the SAW. The SAW agreed that the timetables albeit aggressive where agreeable. It was noted that there was no consideration given in the planning for the Interim Plan for additional user requirements. The concern was clear that we should build something better, more useful than merely modernizing older technologies. It was anticipated that user requirements will be added to the chart when we learn what the Interim Plan is supposed to look like and certainly by the time the Statewide Plan is developed.

There is a meeting scheduled with legislators to discuss their expectations for the Interim Plan.

Roundtable

In the interests of sharing information with the SAW, effective with the next meeting, agencies will be asked to share information on radio/wireless/interoperability projects that they are working on. In the interests of time, and as agencies/organizations are probably not prepared there will be no Roundtable at this meeting.

Technology Clearinghouse

One way to ensure that all are aware of projects and technologies as they become available is by re-instituting the Technology Clearinghouse. Vendors will be diverted to Dennis who will allow them to present technologies to a community of interest. The community of interest will be sent an email from the Technology Clearinghouse ListServ®. (For those who wish to sign up for the SIEC Technology Clearinghouse, please go to http://listserv.wa.gov// click on use lists, then select SIEC Technology Clearinghouse.)

Washington State Department of Transportation, Pre-Solicitation Proposal

Although the Roundtable was suspended, there is one item that is time sensitive and had to be addressed at this meeting. Although not on the agenda, the time sensitive manner of this issue requires that it be added.

The Department of Homeland Security has released a Pre-Solicitation Notice asking for white papers to be submitted that would use new and innovative technology. The Department of Transportation is proposing to submit a proposal that would allow for the use of 700 MHz data to become available in the central Washington Area. WSDOT, WSP and others to send information to PDAs, and laptops will use the spectrum. This will also allow for additional partnering opportunities and will allow for interoperability within that spectrum.

There was some concern that additional projects will limit resources from the main requirements of the SIEC and its mandated requirements. This concern was echoed not only for this project, but also for existing and future projects as we move forward.

Consensus was achieved to agree to allow WSDOT to move forward with this proposal. Additional information will be brought to the SAW once it is determined if this project will be funded.

Creation of a Frequency Coordination Work Group

Discussion on this subject had three major points:

- If the working group were established it should be a *Frequency Management* work group. As a separate issue, the SIEC members present requested additional information about the responsibilities of SIECs in the 700 MHz spectrum. This term denotes a regulatory role of the work group. How could this group manage spectrum already assigned to agencies holding licenses issued by the FCC? How would a state frequency management work group work with already existing frequency coordination agencies, i.e. APCO, ASHTO, etc.? What authority does the SIEC have over this area?
- Although at some future time, there may be a need for a work group that handles these issues, there is nothing required today moving forward at this time.
- What will this group do? Under what authority?

This was tabled at least until such time; as such a work group is required. There was a concern expressed about the need of creating a "funding" group, as it is clear that funding is required for the statewide study.

Update on state inventory – which submitted inventories

As of the time of this meeting the following agencies have submitted inventories:

- Air National Guard
- Army National Guard
- Emergency Management Division
- Department of Transportation
- Department of Health
- Department of Ecology
- State Parks and Recreation
- Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Department of Natural Resources

- Utilities and Transportation Committee[1]
- General Administration[2]
- Department of Revenue[3]
- Washington State Patrol[4]
- Washington State Fire Marshal[5]

It should be noted that surveys are actually due to the SIEC no later than October 31, 2003.

The only agency that has not, not will they be able to submit their survey on time is the Washington Department of Corrections (DOC). DOC requested an extension and the committee chairs granted it until the close of business November 5, 2003.

Copies of the surveys received where distributed to the working group for their information. From a cursory look at the information obtained by the instrument, it appeared to give agencies little if any difficulty.

--Follow up information
It is likely that we will need to contact the contributors of the survey that state government completed to get additional financial information.

--Modifications for local governments
There is a meeting with several of the SAW members and representatives from the associations representing city and county government Monday to determine what modification should be made to the survey before it went out to local government.

--How to get information from local governments
It is noteworthy that Jim Broman asked CAPCOM, the communication center for Thurston County if they would consider filling the form out for the fire department. CAPCOM advised that they would welcome that opportunity. While speaking with local government representatives, it was indicated that they would be able to help in this effort as well.

---

[1] Although this agency submitted a survey, the SIEC did not ask for one. It is unknown how they received the required form.
[2] Although this agency submitted a survey, the SIEC did not ask for one. It is unknown how they received the required form.
[3] Although this agency submitted a survey, the SIEC did not ask for one. It is unknown how they received the required form.
[4] Survey received on October 30, 2003 and for the purposes of this report this agency has satisfied the requirements.
[5] Survey received on October 30, 2003 and for the purposes of this report this agency has satisfied the requirements.

Communications Plan – SIEC Web Page
It was reported that DIS is working on a Communications Plan for the SIEC, including a Web page. One of the things holding us up is the graphics for the SIEC. What should an SIEC look like graphically? Dennis asked members of the SAW if they had any photos that DIS could use that describes interoperability or what they think the SIEC would look like graphically. Dennis will send a reminder to SAW members asking for file photos that perhaps can be used in the banner of the SIEC Web Page, or somewhere else in the Web Property.

De-Brief SIEC Meeting
In an effort to improve on the last SIEC meeting, SAW members where asked to make suggestions to improve subsequent SIEC meetings. One suggestion was to have staff repeat (after writing) motions down on paper. Another approach used by another organization was to have the person making the motion, write the motion down so that it would not be misinterpreted.

Spectrum Coalition
A Spectrum Coalition Handout and PowerPoint presentation were distributed to the SAW. (This information was sent electronically to those joining this meeting telephonically.)

- The main thrust of the Spectrum Coalition is to stop the FCC from auctioning off 10 MHz of spectrum in the upper 700 MHz band.
- Reserve that spectrum for public safety
- Relocated TV broadcasters by 12/31/06
- Enable technologies that meet first responders requirements and are competitive and affordable
- Facilitate nationwide deployment.

This additional spectrum will allow first responders to use this band for video, high resolution images, geospatial data, high speed connectivity and ubiquitous access to information while on the move.

The Spectrum Coalition would like to have the State of Washington join them in their efforts. The efforts would include asking our legislative delegation to sponsor federal legislation stopping the FCC from auctioning this spectrum.

The general conclusion of the SAW is that "there is no downside" to joining the Spectrum Coalition. As there was a complete consensus, this will move to the SIEC in December.

There were three questions that Dennis was going to attempt to get answered, although not stopping moving forward: **(Please see links below in footnotes)**

1. What is Flash *OFDM*[6]?
2. What is *1xEVDO*[7]?
3. What is the *HERO Act*[8]?

Agenda items for December 11 SIEC:

- SIEC State Inventory
- Spectrum Coalition

---

[6] For information on **Flash OFDM**, please refer to: http://www.cellular.co.za/flash-ofdm.htm

[7] For Information on **1xEVDO**, please refer to: http://www.mobiletechnews.com/info/2003/09/29/190458.html

[8] For information on the **"Hero Act"** please refer to: http://www.theorator.com/bills108/hr1425.html